

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jerry Lewis Dedrick,	)	Civil Action No.: 9:14-410-BHH
	)	
	Petitioner, )	
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>OPINION AND ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Warden Cruz,	)	
	)	
	Respondent. )	
_____	)	

Petitioner Jerry Lewis Dedrick (“Petitioner”), a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this habeas relief action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (ECF No. 1). The matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c) D.S.C.

On May 20, 2014, Magistrate Judge Marchant issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the court dismiss the petition without prejudice and service of process. (ECF No. 14.) The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and Recommendation and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. (ECF No. 14 at 7). Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on June 6, 2014.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the

Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report and Recommendation only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 14) by reference into this order. It is therefore ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice and without requiring respondent to file a return.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

July 17, 2014  
Greenville South Carolina